

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o"h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Leaving the Blood Overnight

The *Gemara* asks: And does Rabbi Yehudah hold that if one intended to leave some blood overnight that the sacrifice is *invalid*? But it was taught in a *Baraisa*: Rebbe said: When I went to Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua to have my measures drained (*to have my questions in learning clarified*), and according to others, it was to drain the measures of Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua, I found Yosef the Babylonian sitting before him. Now Yosef was very dear to him, and he (Yosef) asked him many questions until they encountered the following discussion: Teacher, what is the *halachah* if one slaughtered an offering intending to leave the blood for the next day? He replied: It is valid. In the evening (*he asked again, and*) he again replied: It is valid. On the next morning (*he asked again, and*) he again replied: It is valid. At midday (*he asked again, and*) he again replied: It is valid. In the afternoon (*he asked again, and*) he replied: It is valid, but Rabbi Eliezer rules it to be invalid.

At that time, Yosef's face lit up. Rabbi Elazar said to him: Yosef, it seems to me that our teachings did not correspond until now (*for you think that whatever I said previously was incorrect*). Yosef replied: Yes (you were correct)! Except that Rabbi Yehudah had taught me the opinion that it was invalid; and when I sought out all his disciples so as to find a companion for me, I could not find any. But now that you have taught me the opinion that it is invalid, you have restored to me the teaching I had lost. The eyes of Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua streamed with tears, and he said: Fortunate are you, Torah scholars, to whom the words of the Torah are so beloved to you! He then applied to Yosef the

following verse: *How I love your Torah; it is my conversation all day*. For it was only because Rabbi Yehudah was the son of Rabbi Ila'i, and R. Ila'i was the disciple of Rabbi Eliezer that he (Rabbi Yehudah) taught you the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer.

Now if you would think that Rabbi Yehudah taught that everyone holds that it is invalid, then what did Yosef mean when he said that you have restored to me the teaching I had lost? Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua had told him that there was a difference of opinion in the matter (*and that the halachah is that it is valid, whereas he was taught that everyone maintains that it is invalid*)!?

The *Gemara* answers: We must indeed say that Rabbi Yehudah taught that everyone holds that it is invalid; and when Yosef said that you have restored to me the teaching I had lost, he meant that he had brought out that at least someone holds that it is invalid. (18a1 – 18a2)

Mishnah

If one did not pour the oil into the *minchah*, or he did not mix the oil and the flour, or he did not break it into pieces, or he did not salt the *komeitz*, or he did not wave the *minchah*, or he did not bring it close to the (southwestern corner of the) altar, or he broke it into big pieces, or he did not smear it with oil, it is nevertheless valid. (18a2 – 18a3)

Non-Kohen Performing the Services

The *Gemara* asks: What does the *Mishnah* mean when it says that it is valid if he did not pour oil into the *minchah*? It

cannot mean that there was no oil poured at all, for oil is essential to the validity of the *minchah*! Rather, it must mean that a *Kohen* did not pour it, but rather, it was poured by a non-*Kohen*.

The *Gemara* asks: if so, when the *Mishnah* says that the flour and the oil was not mixed, that also means that it was not mixed by a *Kohen*, but rather, it was mixed by a non-*Kohen*. Accordingly, the inference would be that if it was not mixed at all, it would be invalid! But it was taught in a *Mishnah*: Sixty issarons of flour can be mixed together (*with the oil*), but not sixty-one. And we asked: What does it matter if they cannot be mixed together? Have we not learned in a *Mishnah* that If it was not mixed, it is nevertheless valid!? And Rabbi Zeira answered: A *minchah* that is fit for mixing (*of the flour and the oil of the offering; with one log of oil for sixty esronim of flour, and a maximum of sixty esronim in one pan, perfect mixing is possible*), the mixing is not critical to it (*and the offering will be valid even without mixing*); whereas, a *minchah* that is not fit for mixing (*where, the proportions of the mixture were less than a log for sixty esronim or where more than sixty esronim were placed in one pan*), the mixing is critical (*and the offering will not be valid*).

The *Gemara* answers: Each statement of the *Mishnah* has its own meaning. When the *Mishnah* states that he did not pour oil into it, that means that a *Kohen* did not pour it, but rather, it was poured by a non-*Kohen*; and when the *Mishnah* states that he did not mix it, it means that it was not mixed at all. (18a3 – 18b1)

The *Mishnah* had stated: If he broke it into big pieces, it is nevertheless valid.

The *Gemara* asks: If the *halachah* is that if it is not broken into pieces at all, it is valid, then certainly if it's broken into big pieces, it should be valid!? [Why does the *Mishnah* need to teach it?]

The *Gemara* answers that the *Mishnah* means that he broke it into many pieces (*more than the prescribed amount*).

Alternatively, the *Gemara* answers that it is valid if it was not broken at all, for then it is regarded as a loaf; however, big pieces are not loaves, nor are they pieces, so perhaps it would not be valid. The *Mishnah* therefore informs us that it is valid. (18b1 – 18b2)

[The *Gemara* above explained the *Mishnah* to mean that if a non-*Kohen* poured the oil into the *minchah*, it is valid.] The *Gemara* notes that the *Mishnah* is seemingly not in accordance with Rabbi Shimon, for it was taught in a *Baraisa*: Rabbi Shimon said: A *Kohen* who does not accept the service (*he believes that the sacrifices were made up by Moshe, and not commanded by Hashem*) has no portion in the (sacred foods of the) *Kehunah*, for it is written: *One that offers the blood of the shelamim, and the fat, of the sons of Aaron, shall have the right thigh for a portion*. This means to say that if he accepts the service, he has a portion in the *Kehunah*, and if he does not accept the service, he has no portion in the *Kehunah*. Now I know it only of this service stated in the verse (the bringing of the blood to the altar and the bringing of the animal fats to the altar), but where do I know that this applies also to the fifteen services? The *Gemara* proceeds to list the fifteen other services:

1. pouring the oil
2. mixing
3. breaking into pieces
4. salting it
5. waving it
6. bringing it close to the altar
7. taking the *komeitz*
8. burning the *komeitz*
9. performing *melikah*
10. receiving the blood
11. sprinkling it
12. giving the water to a *sotah* to drink
13. breaking the heifer's neck
14. purifying the *metzora*

15. raising the hands in blessing - both within the Temple and outside of it

The verse therefore adds: *of the sons of Aaron*. This includes any service that is given over to the sons of Aaron; and the *Kohen* who does not accept it, has no portion in the *Kehunah*.

Rav Nachman answers: There is no difficulty, for Rabbi Shimon in the *Baraisa* is dealing with the *minchah* of a *Kohen*, and the *Mishnah* is discussing the *minchah* of a *Yisroel*. A *Yisroel's minchah*, which has *kemitzah*, the duty of the *Kehunah* begins with the *kemitzah*; therefore we learn that the pouring in of the oil and the mixing are valid even if they are performed by a non-*Kohen*. The *minchah* of a *Kohen*, however, which has no *kemitzah*, the duty of the *Kehunah* is required from the very beginning.

Rava asked him: Where do we derive that the *mitzvah* of pouring in the oil applies to the *minchah* of a *Kohen* as well? Is it not from a *Yisroel's minchah*? Should we not say then, that just as there - the pouring in may be performed by a non-*Kohen*, so too here (by a *Kohen's minchah*), it may be performed by a non-*Kohen*!?

Others reported the discussion as follows: Rav Nachman answers: There is no difficulty, for the *Mishnah* is discussing the *minchah* offerings which had *kemitzah* (*and therefore the duty of the Kehunah begins with the kemitzah; therefore we learn that the pouring in of the oil and the mixing are valid even if they are performed by a non-Kohen*). Rabbi Shimon in the *Baraisa* is dealing with the *minchah* offerings which did not have *kemitzah* (*and therefore the duty of the Kehunah is required from the very beginning*).

Rava asked him: Where do we derive that the *mitzvah* of pouring in the oil applies to the *minchah* which does not have *kemitzah* performed as well? Is it not from a *minchah* which does have *kemitzah*? Should we not say then, that just as there - the pouring in may be performed by a non-*Kohen*, so too here (by a *Kohen's minchah*), it may be performed by a non-*Kohen*!?

Rather, the *Gemara* concludes, it is clear that the *Mishnah* is not following Rabbi Shimon's opinion.

The *Gemara* asks: What is the reason of the Sages (*who maintain that a non-Kohen may pour in the oil of the minchah*)?

The *Gemara* answers: It is written: *And he shall pour oil upon it. And he shall put levonah upon it, and he shall bring it to Aaron's sons, the Kohanim, and the Kohen shall take the komeitz*. From the *kemitzah* and onwards is the duty of the *Kehunah*. We learn that the pouring in of the oil and the mixing are valid even when performed by a non-*Kohen*. (18b2 – 18b4)

DAILY MASHAL

Simchas Torah

The *mashgiach* of the Grodna Yeshivah, HaGaon Rabbi Hillel Kagan zt"l, noticed a student who wouldn't attend the *shi'urim* of HaGaon Rav S Rozovski zt"l. The reason, he explained, was because he couldn't understand. Rabbi Kagan summoned him to his room and enthusiastically presented him with a question mentioned in the *shi'ur*. "Do you understand the question?"

"Yes, and I'll repeat it."

"No!" Rabbi Kagan interrupted him. "You don't understand. If you understood, you would be very happy. Let me explain to you again..."

After the second explanation Rabbi Kagan again asked him if he understood. He wasn't satisfied with his positive reply but repeated the question again and again till the student smiled with joy. "That's it!" Rabbi Kagan was happy. "Now you understand!" (Zecher Hillel).